For the Northern District of California

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
9	SAN JOSE DIVISION
10	KUANG-BAO P. OU-YOUNG, CASE NOs. 5:14-cv-80214 EJD; 5:14-cv-80215 EJD
11	Plaintiff(s), ORDER DENYING LEAVE TO FILE
12	v. COMPLAINTS
13 14	CHARLES R. BREYER, District Judge, United States District Court for the Northern District of California
15	
16	Defendant(s).
17	KUANG-BAO P. OU-YOUNG,
18	DI: 4:66()
19	Plaintiff(s), v.
20	BETH L. FREEMAN, District Judge, United States District Court for the Northern District of California
21	
22	Defendant(s)
23	Defendant(s).
24	Plaintiff Kuang-Bao P. Ou-Young ("Plaintiff") is subject to a pre-filing order which requires
25	him to obtain leave of court before initiating new litigation. See Docket Item No. 40 in Case No.
26	3:13-cv-04442 EMC. Presently before the court are two Complaints submitted by Plaintiff. This
27	court reviews the Complaints to "determine whether Plaintiff has stated a potentially cognizable
28	claim in a short, intelligible and plain statement." <u>Id</u> .
	1 CASE NOs. 5:14-cv-80214 EJD; 5:14-cv-80215 EJD ORDER DENYING LEAVE TO FILE COMPLAINTS

Plaintiff has not done so. He seeks to assert claims against two federal judges - Judge
Charles R. Breyer and Judge Beth Labson Freeman - for "obstruction" pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 1509
But Plaintiff cannot state a cognizable claim under that criminal statute because it neither provides
nor implies a private right of action. See generally, Aldabe v. Aldabe, 616 F.2d 1089, 1092 (9th Cir
1980). Moreover, civil liability cannot be imposed on Judge Breyer and Judge Freeman for the
judicial acts alleged. Moore v. Brewster, 96 F.3d 1240, 1243-44 (9th Cir. 1996) (explaining that
"[a] judge is generally immune from a civil action for damages" for acts done in a judicial capacity,
no matter how erroneous or injurious it may be). Thus, judicial immunity would preclude these
lawsuits even if Plaintiff had invoked a statute which allows for private enforcement.

For these reasons, the court finds that the instant Complaints fall within the scope of pleadings barred by the pre-filing order. Accordingly, leave to file these Complaints is DENIED. IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 29, 2014

